

Motions: Netherlands amendments

Motion 2: to strike the words at the end of paragraph 3 from “The branch also believes” up to and including “his police pension”. “

To strike the final item numbered (ii)in its entirety and remove the numbering from (i) and let the sentence run: “... to urge them to withdraw Sir Norman Bettison’s knighthood ...” to end at “honours system.”

Reasoning: There are practical reasons and those of principle not to interfere with his pension rights.

Motion 3: To amend the motion by adding at the end of the text after the words “private vehicles” the words “, as a first step towards further nationalisation of public transport.”

Reasoning: We note the changes made to the original motion which add to the argument of promoting public transport and reducing the use of private vehicles by calling for the alleviation of hardship due to present crises. We note that the present provision of bus transportation in rural areas in particular remains insufficient to enable people to move away from private transport (e.g. no buses or insufficient buses at certain parts of the day), as the cited interim report on the price cap makes clear. A cap on the price of a single journey while welcome is only the first step needed in a radical reworking of the transportation system in

favour of the people, especially those living in rural areas.

Motion 4. To amend the first sentence in the third paragraph by striking the words “, at this time,” and replacing the word “is” by “was” and striking the word “highly”.

Reasoning: The visit of the King has already taken place; while the visit was arguably undesirable at this point in history, his address to Congress has been widely appreciated as a subtle but clear rebuke to the policies of the government of the USA, and was well received in the Congress by both Republicans and Democrats. The word ‘highly’ does not do justice to this fact. The visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales serves a very different purpose and is unlikely to have a similar effect to that of the visit of the King, and is therefore not supported.

With regard to the first Motion, while sympathetic to the intentions behind this motion, we had difficulty in understanding what this would practically entail and believe it would more effective if different arguments were made clear, perhaps in separate motions. We did not feel able to raise an amendment to achieve this ourselves.